

Wisconsin Program Enhancement Plan

Progress Report for Quarter 4

August 2005 – October 2005

Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services

Division of Children and Family Services

Submitted December 1, 2005

To:

Federal Administration for Children and Families

Wisconsin PEP Progress Report for Quarter 4

Contents

	Page
List of Attachments	2
Introduction	3
PEP Implementation Team Activities	4
General PEP Updates	6
Continuous Quality Improvement Program	9
Quarter 4 Accomplishments	12
Quarter 4 Accomplishments/Quarter 5 Activities	14
Quarter 5 Activities	25
PEP Data Update	26
Performance Chart for National Standards	28
Changes to PEP Matrix	35

Attachments to PEP Progress Report:

1. PEP Implementation Team 8/31/05 agenda
2. PEP Performance Item Baseline Adjustments
3. DCFS Memo Series 2005-08
4. DCFS Info Memo 2005-11
5. DCFS Memo Series 2005-12
6. DCFS Memo Series 2005-13
7. DCFS Memo Series 2005-14
8. Draft Safety Intervention Standards
9. Draft memo on trial home visits
10. Draft memo on permanency plan reviewer materials
11. Draft memo on sibling placement
12. Draft memo on ICWA notification
13. Draft memo on information sharing with relatives
14. Legislative amendment on information sharing
15. DCFS Memo Series 2005-10
16. Draft memo on foster parent support services
17. Draft memo on foster parent support plans
18. Draft Ch. HFS 44 administrative rule
19. Draft memo on adoptive resource availability
20. Draft memo on continuous permanency planning
21. Training recommendations
22. eWiSACWIS training committee charge
23. Chronology of safety data approval
24. Updated 12/1/05 PEP Matrix

Introduction

This progress report describes Program Enhancement Plan (PEP) implementation activities completed during August 1, 2005 through October 31, 2005, which is the fourth quarter of the two-year PEP period. The report also describes planned activities that will occur during the fifth quarter of November 1, 2005 through February 28, 2006. Since PEP action steps have benchmark tasks occurring in successive quarters, the narrative for most items covers both the accomplishments in the most recent quarter and planned activities in the next quarter.

The PEP is administered by the Division of Children and Family Services (DCFS), the state child welfare agency within the Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS). The PEP is being implemented with the cooperation and participation of county and tribal child welfare agencies and other stakeholders on the PEP Implementation Team.

The progress report refers to Action Steps in the PEP, as approved by the federal Administration for Children and Families (ACF), to respond to the findings of the federal Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) of Wisconsin. The Action Steps are described in the Matrix portion of the PEP. An updated PEP Matrix reflecting changes for Quarter 4 is attached to this progress report.

The complete PEP and information about the PEP process is available at:

<http://dhfs.wisconsin.gov/cwreview/PEP.htm>

PEP Contact Person:

John Tuohy, Planning Director
Division of Children and Family Services
1 W. Wilson Street, Room 550
Madison, WI 53708-8916
Phone 608-267-3832
Fax 608-266-6836
Email: tuohyjo@dhfs.state.wi.us

PEP Implementation Team Activities

The PEP Implementation Team was formed in August 2004 and the first meeting was held on November 29, 2004. The Implementation Team was created as a collaborative, cross-systems approach to guide planning and implementation of child welfare practice and policy in order to achieve the federal performance outcomes and enhance services to Wisconsin's children and families. The Implementation Team is comprised of over 80 individuals representing a wide array of diverse fields, including domestic abuse, schools, law enforcement, juvenile justice, state courts, health care, mental health, substance abuse, and child protective services. In addition, the Implementation Team has representation from foster and adoptive parents, tribes, advocacy groups and state legislators.

The PEP Implementation Team held its fourth meeting on August 31, 2005 (agenda is attached). The August meeting included discussion of PEP committee reports, recommendations from the ad hoc committee on training requirements, Quarter 3 accomplishments, state performance on national safety and permanency standards, and state and federal child welfare program updates. The next Implementation Team meeting took place on November 1, 2005. The Implementation Team meetings are held quarterly and broadcast on the Internet to allow remote participation. Information about the Implementation Team is available at:

<http://dhfs.wisconsin.gov/cwreview/PEP-Team/pepTeam.htm>

The PEP Implementation Team utilizes five PEP committees to help shape the policies, procedures, and practices needed to complete the twenty (20) Action Steps identified in the Wisconsin PEP. The Executive Committee held its first meeting in February 2005 and meets quarterly to set agendas for full Implementation Team meetings. The other PEP committees held their first meetings in January or February 2005 and met at least monthly during calendar year (CY) 2005. The PEP committees and their respective responsibilities are as follows:

- **PEP Executive Committee**

The Executive Committee of the full PEP Implementation Team meets between the PEP Implementation Team meetings to assist DCFS in creating long-term goals and strategies for the PEP Implementation Team, including the development of the agendas for the quarterly meetings.

- **Child Welfare Case Process**

The Child Welfare Case Process Committee clarifies and develops policies and guidelines for standards of practice related to Access/Intake, Initial Assessment, and Ongoing Services. In addition, this Committee addresses issues related to domestic violence and other child welfare associated programs and service systems.

- **Out-of-Home Care**

The Out-of-Home Care Committee enhances policies, practices, and procedures related to Out-of-Home Placement, Title IV-E, Permanency Planning, Independent Living, Kinship Care, and the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC).

- **Adoption Services**

The Adoption Services Committee develops and updates policies, practices, and procedures related to Concurrent Permanency Planning, Termination of Parental Rights (TPR), Adoption, Adoption Search, and Adoption Assistance payments.

- **Continuous Quality Improvement**

The Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Committee designs and implements a county review process including an on-site review process and identifies the management and program information needs of counties and tribes for child welfare data reports.

In addition, for PEP Action Steps and other policy issues that involve tribal child welfare or child welfare staff and provider training, the existing Indian Child Welfare Coordination Group and State Training Council are consulted by the PEP Implementation Team for expertise and guidance. Training updates are provided at PEP Implementation Team meetings.

To facilitate public input on policies and procedures related to PEP action steps, DCFS created the PEP Bulletin Board for materials developed by PEP committees to be available for public comment. The availability of the Bulletin Board has been publicized to counties, tribes and other key stakeholders. The Bulletin Board can be accessed at:

<http://dhfs.wisconsin.gov/cwreview/bulletinBrd.htm>

General PEP Updates

Updates to PEP Performance Item Baselines

Wisconsin was determined to be in non-conformance for 19 of the 23 safety, permanency and well-being outcome items based on the August 2003 CFSR case review process. Performance measurement methods for these 19 items were developed using safety data (NCANDS) and permanency data (AFCARS) reported to the federal government or state data. Performance for the majority of the 19 items will be measured using results from the state case review process. The performance baselines for these items using case review results were originally set based on the scores from the August 2003 federal review. As specified in PEP Action Step Q.2, DCFS conducted limited case reviews in three counties to provide additional case review results for purposes of updating the performance baselines. The limited case reviews are described in the PEP progress report for Quarter 3.

Using the limited case review results, DCFS is proposing adjustments to the performance baselines for those items using case reviews as the measurement method. The description of the performance baseline adjustments is attached to this report.

For one of the safety outcomes items, timeliness of child protective services (CPS) investigations, information from the eWiSACWIS child welfare data system is used to measure performance. A performance baseline was not established for this item in the original PEP because the data report had to be developed. The performance baseline adjustment document includes the proposed baseline for this item. Additional information on the data used for this outcome item is included in the PEP Data section of this report.

CPS Ongoing Service Standards

The CPS Ongoing Service Standards and Practice Guidelines, which were originally issued in 2002, are referenced in three of the PEP Action Steps – Steps F.1.b, J.1 and N.2. The CPS Ongoing Standards are identified in the PEP as a mechanism to enhance child and family involvement in case planning and to address the needs and services of children, parents, and foster parents (Well-Being Outcome Items 17 and 18). The PEP proposed issuing revised Ongoing Service Standards that would incorporate the family interaction and visitation policy (F.1.b), converting current practice guidelines relating to family assessment and case planning to policy standards (J.1), and incorporating other relevant policy issues identified in the PEP or the five-year Wisconsin Child and Family Service Plan submitted by DCFS in June 2004. Per Step N.2, the revised CPS Ongoing Standards were scheduled to be issued in Quarter 5 and become effective in Quarter 7. Several recent developments, however, impact the timing of making revisions to the Ongoing Service Standards including:

- The promulgation of Ch. HFS 44, the administrative rule on reasonable efforts and permanency planning, in Q8. This rule is directly related to ongoing child protective services practice and addressing the needs of children, parents, and foster parents. As described under Action Step N.1, HFS 44 was originally scheduled to be issued in Quarter 7 and will now be issued in Quarter 8.
- The PEP Case Process Committee has recommended that revisions be made to the CPS Investigation Standards, originally issued in 1994, prior to making further changes to the Ongoing Service Standards. The recommended changes to the Investigation Standards are directly related to CPS ongoing services. The planned revisions to the CPS Investigation Standards will not occur during the two-year PEP time period
- Action Step M identifies strategies to improve screening of child welfare clients for mental health issues. The tools related to mental health screening will not be finalized until Quarter 8 and this information is directly tied to the child functioning element in the family assessment and the case planning process.
- As part of a Quality Improvement project for use of the eWiSACWIS system, counties have recommended significant changes to the family assessment and case plan in the system, including efforts to make the documents more useful to families and other users. Interim changes will be made to the case plan and a committee has been established to make long-term recommendations for improving the case plan.

Consistent with these developments, the PEP case Process Committee has recommended deferring the revisions to the Ongoing Service Standards until CY 2007, which is beyond the two-year PEP period. Based on this recommendation, the PEP is being revised to reflect that the Ongoing Service Standards will be revised at a later date. The PEP Action Steps have been changed to reflect other actions to promote family engagement and involvement in the child protective services case process as follows:

- Implementation of the Safety Intervention Standards under Action Step B will be used to enhance family involvement in the case planning process. The Safety Intervention Standards promote fully informing parents about identified safety threats and needed services/interventions, using strengths/enhanced protective capacities to contribute to successful outcomes, and involving parents throughout the CPS case process so that their capacity to protect their children is enhanced to assure a safe home. Regional roundtables will be held in order to support child welfare supervisors in fully understanding and implementing the Safety Intervention Standards.
- The family assessment, case plan, and case progress evaluation in eWiSACWIS will be streamlined to support caseworkers in focusing on critical issues related to child safety and parental protective capacities. The Child Welfare Case Process Committee developed the attached revised formats that are more user-friendly for families and staff. The revised formats are tentatively scheduled for the June 2006 eWiSACWIS maintenance release.

- The policy on caseworker face-to-face contact issued under Action Step J.4 will promote better communication between caseworkers and families and lead to improved involvement of families through the case process. Regional roundtables conducted to implement the policy have emphasized the importance of engaging families in the case process.
- The Child Welfare Training Partnerships will continue to provide training related to family engagement and involvement throughout CPS involvement. DCFS will also work with the Child Welfare Training Partnerships to host five (5) regional forums in 2006 that focus on this issue.
- Implementation of county case reviews through the Continuous Quality Improvement process will be used to inform statewide policy as well as training and technical assistance for county staff. This process, which utilizes the Quality Services Review (QSR) case review method, examines in depth family engagement and involvement in the case planning process through interviews with parents, children, child welfare staff, services providers, and others. The experiences of counties going through the QSR reviews will generate best practice information that can be shared with counties statewide.

Continuous Quality Improvement Program

This section of the report addresses activities of the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) program within DCFS, including implementation of the Quality Service Review (QSR) case review process with counties and other activities to ensure compliance with federal program requirements. References to PEP Action Steps in parentheses are to the specific Action Steps in the PEP Matrix.

1. QSR Implementation

During the fourth quarter, the QSR design team met to finalize the Wisconsin version of the QSR protocol. The Wisconsin QSR was piloted twice, in Pierce and Washington Counties, in September 2005. In total, 22 cases were reviewed. Upon completion of the two county pilots the QSR protocol was further refined and modified in October 2005, with input from the reviewers, to enable more accurate and reliable scoring.

DCFS developed a cross-walk between the QSR case review tool and the federal CFSR case review tool to determine how the QSR scores will be used for purposes of reporting state performance on the CFSR safety, permanency and well-being outcome items. The QSR review tool and the CFSR cross-walk were submitted for federal approval in October 2005.

Rock County volunteered to be the first county in the roll-out of the QSR county review process (10/31/05 – 11/4/05). The review was conducted using CQI unit staff and certified QSR reviewers from other states. The scores from the Rock County review along with other county reviews will be reported starting with the PEP Progress report for Quarter 5.

DCFS also began development of a Wisconsin peer reviewer system. Thirty people participated in two 2-day trainings, with the intention of most becoming certified QSR reviewers. The CQI program will begin drawing from this pool of peer reviewers in upcoming county QSR reviews, beginning with Waukesha County (12/5/05 – 12/9/05).

Twenty-nine additional counties have accepted an invitation from DCFS to volunteer for a QSR review and are scheduled for review between December 2005 and October 2007.

2. ICWA Monitoring (G.3)

The QSR review tool incorporated select ICWA requirements into the QSR Protocol. Practice Performance Indicator 9, titled Cultural Accommodations specifically takes into consideration all cultural issues. Attention to ICWA requirement has also been added to other QSR performance indicators where appropriate. In order to score this particular area the reviewers will need to ask questions that are specific to ICWA requirements in each case that is reviewed.

The manager of the CQI program will meet with the eleven federally-recognized tribes to explain how the QSR county review process is carried out, and ascertain tribal interest in participating in future reviews in counties with a significant tribal population.

DCFS will continue to monitor ICWA compliance as an ongoing responsibility of the DCFS Indian Child Welfare Consultant position who will work with counties and tribes. The eWiSACWIS report on ICWA notification under Action Step G.4 is in statewide use and DCFS and regional Area Administrative staff are using the report to monitor documentation of ICWA notifications to tribes in eWiSACWIS.

3. Children's Court Initiative (O.6)

An emerging partnership has formed between the DCFS CQI program and the Children's Court Initiative (CCI) operated by the Director of State Courts Office to collaborate county review activities of the child welfare and court systems. Whenever possible, county review activities are combined to reduce duplication and minimize disruption to the county.

The CQI and CCI projects conducted certain joint focus groups during the Pierce and Washington County reviews in the fourth quarter. During the fifth quarter, the CQI and CCI staff will continue collaborating on scheduled reviews in Rock, Waukesha and Iowa counties. CQI and CCI jointly conduct the following focus groups in each county: caseworkers, supervisors/managers, guardians ad litem, corporation counsel/district attorneys, and judges. This area of overlap is particularly beneficial in using joint focus groups to gather stakeholder opinions about the strengths of and identifying opportunities for improving outcomes in the county child welfare and court systems.

Because the CQI review gathers more qualitative information (case participation interviews) and CCI review is more quantitative in nature (case file reviews and court observation), the CQI program is working with CCI to jointly explore how best to use both types of information to benefit county child welfare and court systems.

4. County Case Review Model (Q.3)

The QSR design team met on August 24, 2005 to finalize the "Wisconsinized" version of the QSR protocol. The design team consisted of experts from multiple disciplines including child welfare, AODA, domestic violence, education, mental and behavioral health, and county management.

The first pilot of the Wisconsin version of the QSR took place in Pierce County the week of September 12 – 16, 2005. Ten families receiving services from the county child welfare system were selected at random for the review. Reviewer mentors were brought in from Alabama, Florida, and Iowa, which allowed the CQI Specialists to begin their process of becoming certified reviewers.

The second pilot of the Wisconsin version of the QSR took place in Washington County the week of September 26 – 30, 2005. Twelve families receiving services from the county child welfare system were selected at random for the review. Reviewer mentors were brought in from Iowa to allow some peer reviewers to begin the process of becoming certified reviewers, while the CQI Specialists gained more experience in conducting reviews.

After the two pilot reviews, adjustments were made to the Wisconsin version of the QSR based on the experiences of the reviewers and mentors.

DCFS Memo Series 2005-08 (copy attached) dated September 14, 2005 was issued outlining the development and implementation of the CQI program and requesting input from counties concerning the timing of their participation in the QSR county review cycle. Counties were asked to submit their volunteer requests by October 14, 2005.

A number of counties volunteered to participate in the CQI review process and a proposed schedule was developed through October 2007. Beginning with Rock County the week of October 31 – November 4, 2005, there will be 15 counties reviewed during the 5th through 8th quarters of the PEP. Sixteen counties are tentatively scheduled for reviews in the period of November 2006 through October 2007.

5. BMCW Comprehensive Review Process (Q.4)

Review activities for the Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare (BMCW) Comprehensive Review began in September 2005 and will be completed in December 2005. Discussions between the DCFS Office of Program Evaluation and Planning (OPEP) and BMCW staff during Quarter 4 resulted in the modification of the case review instrument used for the evaluation of Ongoing Case Management services to record specific data elements on the cases reviewed and to elicit comments and analysis from the reviewers which would allow the findings to be compared to those generated from the CFSR case review instrument.

The ongoing case management portion of the review was completed in November. The BMCW case results will be tabulated and included in the next PEP Progress Report along with QSR case review scores. The complete report on the BMCW Comprehensive review will be released in March 2006.

6. Develop QA Reviewers (Q.5)

In collaboration with the DCFS CQI unit, the CQI contractor The Management Group (TMG) put together a 2-day training for developing QSR reviewers. The initial training was held on October 25-26 and again on October 27-28 in Madison and Ray Foster, from Human Services and Outcomes from Florida, conducted the training. A group of 15 trainees were in attendance for each of the 2 day trainings. The prerequisite to acceptance to the training was for trainees to agree to serve as a case reviewer in two QSR reviews during the coming year.

The attendees were awarded continuing education hours (CEHs) for their time. They will also be awarded CEHs for the mentoring they will receive leading to their certification as lead case reviewers. A plan to compensate certified lead case peer reviewers is in the development process. This is similar to the compensation system for case reviewers used in the federal CFSR reviews.

Quarter 4 Accomplishments

The following is a summary of the activities completed during the PEP Quarter 4 period of August 1, 2005 to October 31, 2005. References to PEP Action Steps in parentheses are to the specific Action Steps in the PEP Matrix.

1. Permanency Planning Procedures (D.2 and D.4)

D.2 - Permanency Plan Procedures. DCFS issued Information Memo 2005-11 on *Current Federal and State Requirements for Permanency Plan Content and Procedures* (copy attached) which contains clarification on definitions, procedures and content of initial and subsequent permanency plans, permanency plan reviews, permanency plan hearings and transitional plans for independent living. The memo also includes a discussion of the authority to enable TPR prior to identification of an adoptive resources, and application of exceptions to the reasonable efforts requirements.

D.4 - Definition of Terms. A separate memorandum on definitions of “difficult to place” and “at risk” children has been drafted and distributed to the Adoption Committee at its November meeting, and will be provided to the Out-of-home Care Committee in December for review and comment.

D.2 - Permanency Plan Review Report. DCFS implemented a statewide permanency plan review report template in the June 2005 eWiSACWIS maintenance release. DCFS issued Memo Series 2005-12, *eWiSACWIS Permanency Plan Review Changes and Template* (copy attached) in Quarter 4 to support the use of the template.

Training on Reasonable Efforts and Permanency Planning. DCFS is working with the Director of State Courts Office to develop further training and facilitate discussions between judges and county directors regarding permanency planning and other changes arising out of the PEP. The training and discussions will occur in the Spring of 2006, at Judicial District meetings.

2. Tribal Child Welfare (G.2)

Indian Child Welfare Consultant. The DCFS hired an Indian Child Welfare Consultant to work with tribes and counties regarding issues related to the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA), other state and federal laws, and tribal involvement in all child welfare-related policies and programs. A primary responsibility of this position is to work with tribal, county, and state staff in implementing the seven tribal priorities included as an appendix to the PEP and the Wisconsin Child and Family Services Plan. The position was filled by Ms. Loa Porter, a member of the Ho-Chunk Nation, who has been involved in child welfare for many years with the Grand Portage Tribe in Minnesota and the Ho-Chunk Nation in Wisconsin. In addition, Ms. Porter held a position similar to the Indian Child Welfare Consultant position in the State of Minnesota.

DCFS has continued to meet on a bimonthly basis with the child welfare directors and staff of all eleven federally-recognized tribes and has been implementing various pieces of the seven tribal priorities. Among these activities include the establishment in eWiSACWIS of four templates designed to determine whether a child entering the child welfare system is an Indian child, to notify

tribes of that involvement, and to request the membership or eligibility for membership status of those children in the tribe. DCFS has recently established a workgroup to examine the need to update or otherwise revise the content and purpose of 161 Agreements to assure that services to Indian children are being provided in an appropriate manner by the county and tribal agency. DCFS is continuing to work with the Inter-Tribal Child Welfare Training Partnership in the development of curriculum around the Indian Child Welfare Act and the provision of services to Indian children and their families.

3. Legal Services (O.5)

On October 27, 2005, DCFS issued Memo Series 2005-13, *Title IV-E Reimbursement for Legal Services* (copy attached). The purpose of the reimbursement program is to provide funding to counties to support the expansion of legal services for child welfare programs. The legal services must be related to protecting the safety of children and achieving permanence for children in out-of-home care. Under the legal services reimbursement program, federal IV-E funds will be provided on a pass-through basis to counties to support attorneys, paralegals, clerical, and other legal staff whose positions are, in whole or in part, dedicated to child welfare legal actions under Chapter 48. The memo included information on the legal services reimbursement program, instructions for counties to apply to participate in the program, and instructions for previously-approved counties to continue receiving funds. At the same time, a DCFS letter was sent to all county human/social services directors to call their attention to the new memo and to encourage them to consider participating in the program.

Quarter 4 Accomplishments / Quarter 5 Activities

1. Access Standard (A.1)

The Child Protective Services Access Standard and the Appendices are documents to provide more clarity and direction to CPS staff around gathering and documenting information received when a report of alleged child maltreatment is received and in making the screening and response time decisions. The Access Standard was developed by a workgroup consisting of county, tribal, state and private agency representatives, and revised based on input provided by the broad statewide review process.

The drafts of the Access Standard and Appendices were reviewed by the Wisconsin County Human Services Association (WCHSA) in September. WCHSA concurred that the Access Standard and Appendices represented good practice and, although expressing a concern related to workload, recommended that the standard be adopted without any changes. The Access Standard and Appendices were issued by DCFS Memo Series 2005-14 (copy attached) following a final review by DCFS staff. The Access Standard becomes effective on March 31, 2006, when all the changes in eWiSACWIS necessary to support implementation of the Standard have been achieved.

The process to change the Access Report in the eWiSACWIS system was begun in August 2005 by establishing a series of meetings with the eWiSACWIS design team to conceptualize the enhancements needed to support the revised Access Standard. Subsequently, a series of specific design sessions took place, with the opportunity for extensive county input provided via webcast technology. The system change is extensive enough that it will not be completed until March 2006. The enhancement will include using one document to gather information at the first point of contact. The supervisor will then have the ability to assign the assessment process most suitable for the Access Report (e.g. CPS assessment, offer of voluntary services, etc.).

2. Multiple Reports and Allegations (A.2)

The Child Welfare Case Process Committee devoted Section VII of the Access Standard to describing how to handle multiple reports on open cases. The delineation of how reports will be handled provides guidelines to ensure a report on the same conditions is incorporated into the current report and passed on to the appropriate worker. This multiple report/allegation procedure was included in the Access Standard issued by DCFS Memo Series 2005-14.

3. Safety Assessment and Planning (B.1)

The draft Safety Intervention Standards were reviewed statewide in Quarter 4 by county and tribal directors, supervisors, and line staff as well as other key stakeholders. The Safety Intervention Standards and the appendices will provide more clarity and direction to CPS staff around safety intervention and management throughout the CPS case process. In addition, these Standards provide direction to staff related to parent involvement in the safety planning process, assessing and understanding a parent's protective capacities, and providing services and supports that enhance the parent's protective role.

The Safety Intervention Standards and Appendices were posted to the PEP Bulletin Board for further review and comment in October. These documents will continue to be posted to the Bulletin Board in Quarter 5 before the draft Standards are reviewed by the Wisconsin County Human Services Association in December 2005. The Safety Intervention Standards will be issued in January 2006 (Quarter 5).

The effective date of the Safety Intervention Standards will be changed to Q7 to match the June 2006 release date of the system changes necessary in eWiSACWIS. This will better support implementation of the Standards by caseworkers and supervisors.

4. Trial Home Visits (C. 1. b)

The Out-of-home Care Committee has formed a workgroup to develop the Trial Home Visit Policy. The policy was discussed, and drafts reviewed at the September, October and November Committee meetings. The current draft (copy attached) is being revised and will be reviewed by the entire Out-of-Home Care Committee in December; it will also be shared with the Case Process Committee.

DCFS is also developing instructions for entering and tracking Trial Home Visits in eWiSACWIS. The instructions will be placed in the Placement Procedure Manual referenced in Action Step C.3.

5. Re-entry and Placement Stability (C.1 and C.2)

A review of eWiSACWIS case records was conducted for 100 cases selected from Dane, Rock, Sheboygan and Winnebago Counties to analyze issues affecting re-entry to out-of-home care. The counties were selected based on eWiSACWIS outcome reports showing high re-entry rates or frequent placement changes. The following issues were noted regarding placement re-entry rates:

- 78% of cases reviewed had at least one instance of where documentation of shelter or secure detention settings may not be consistent with AFCARS reporting requirements
- 17% of cases reviewed had an instance of a child being AWOL between placement episodes
- 18% of cases reviewed had an institutional placement across the placement episodes
- 70% of cases reviewed had an open court order at the time of re-entry into out-of-home care
- 41% of cases reviewed had no documentation associated with receiving post reunification services

Based on a review of 100 cases from the same counties, the following issues regarding placement stability were noted:

- 37% of cases reviewed had at least one setting documented related to the use of shelter or secure detention settings that may not have been consistent with AFCARS reporting requirements
- 14% of cases reviewed had an instance of AWOL within the current placement episode
- 15% of cases reviewed had documentation indicated the use of multiple receiving homes with the given placement episode
- 22% of cases reviewed had multiple institutional placements across the given placement episode
- 16% of cases reviewed had placement changes that were determined not to be in the best interests of the child based on other related casework documentation

A full analysis of the review results will be completed by December 2005 and will address agency practice, policy and documentation considerations and program resource implications. Additional areas to be considered for further study will also be identified.

The results of the Targeted Case Review will be shared with the directors of the participating county agencies, the PEP Out-of-Home Care Committee, DCFS policy development staff, and other key stakeholder groups in Quarter 5.

6. Concurrent Permanency Plan (D.1)

Under state and federal law, establishing concurrent permanence goals is optional. DCFS will provide guidance regarding the consideration of developing a concurrent permanence goal at the permanency review or hearing conducted within 12 months of the child's removal from home. The primary mechanism for establishing a concurrent goal will be through the Continuous Permanency Planning process identified in Action Step O.3. State permanency consultants are currently working with counties to identify children for whom concurrent goals should be established. The continuous permanency planning timeline will support establishing a concurrent goal at the 12-month point where appropriate.

The PEP Matrix originally specified that a DCFS Numbered memo would be issued to establish a concurrent permanence goal policy requirement. Based on directions from the PEP Out-of-home Care Committee, the Continuous Permanency Planning process will be used to support concurrent planning efforts by counties. Consideration of additional policy direction regarding establishing concurrent goals will take place during public discussions on the proposed Ch. HFS 44 administrative rule related to reasonable efforts and permanency planning under Action Step N.1.

7. Informational Materials for Permanency Plan Reviewers (D.3)

During Quarter 4, the Out-of-Home Care Committee developed, revised, and finalized an informational brochure for permanency plan panel members. During development, the brochure was posted to the PEP Bulletin Board on two separate occasions and those comments were used to further guide revisions. To date, the brochure has been approved by DCFS and is currently in the process of being published. A copy of the draft DCFS memo and brochure is attached.

8. Sibling Placement Documentation and Rate Incentive (E.1 and E.2)

The Out-of-Home Care Committee developed a draft informational memo (copy attached) describing the importance of sibling placement, justification for sibling placement or separation, and application of the exceptional rate to support siblings together in out-of-home care. The memo was revised in October 2005 due to feedback from Committee members. The most recent draft of the policy is currently posted on the PEP Bulletin Board. Based upon a few initial comments on the Bulletin Board, DCFS staff are proceeding with some edits to the memo. It will be reviewed at the next Out-of-Home Care Committee meeting in December 2005 and hopefully will be approved by the committee at that time.

9. Capacity of Foster Homes (E.3)

The Out-of-Home Care Committee recently developed a proposal to increase the capacity of foster homes to support the placement of additional siblings in a foster home. Current statutory language allows up to four children placed in a foster home or up to six children to keep siblings together or other limits if the Department creates rules otherwise. Committee members thought that the limits for the number of children who can be placed in a foster home should remain the same, but that agencies should be allowed to grant exceptions to allow additional siblings in specific circumstances.

Committee members recommend changing Ch. HFS 56, Adm. Code, the foster home licensing rule, to allow licensing agencies to grant exceptions to allow between six to eight children to be placed if the placement allows siblings to remain together. Agencies could also apply to the Department Exceptions Panel to seek placement of more than eight children in a foster home to keep siblings placed together. This proposal would not change any other licensing requirements nor would it impact the capacity of treatment foster homes.

10. Family Interaction Policy (F.1)

DCFS issued the Family Interaction policy through DCFS Memo Series 2005–06 (copy previously submitted) on July 31, 2005. During Quarter 4, DCFS staff provided training/technical assistance to child welfare supervisors and caseworkers.

During Quarter 5, DCFS Bureau of Programs and Policies (BPP) staff will continue to work with the Bureau of Regulation and Licensing (BRL) to communicate this policy with out-of-home care providers and answer any questions or concerns. Communication efforts included a BPP staff attending a BRL/BPP meeting, which consisted of Licensing Specialists and Chiefs, Adoption Supervisors and a Child Welfare Program Specialist. In addition, a BPP staff will be attending the Statewide Foster Care Coordinators meeting in December 2005 and will send the memo out to all child placing agencies, group homes, residential care centers, and shelters. BPP will also provide agencies and out-of-home care providers with a Q & A as a reference. Also during Quarter 5, the Family Interaction policy will be incorporated into pre-service training for foster parents and staff.

11. ICWA Notification (F.2)

In order to improve timely and accurate identification of Indian children in the child welfare system and assure compliance with the tribal notification requirements of the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA), four templates were developed in conjunction with the Tribal Child Welfare Coordination Group. These templates have been available for statewide use since December 2004 and are currently being used by child welfare staff in the state. The templates have been discussed with county staff over the past 12 months. An ICWA training curriculum was developed by the Inter-Tribal Child Welfare Training Partnership in collaboration with the Milwaukee Training Partnership. The curriculum was piloted in Milwaukee at the beginning of Quarter 3. The curriculum is being reviewed by the Tribal Child Welfare Coordination Group and will be finalized for statewide use in January 2006.

A DCFS Numbered Memo (copy attached) on the use of the templates will be issued in Quarter 5. There have been minor changes to the memo as the result of a review by the Wisconsin County Human Services Association. The templates continue to be available for local agency use.

12. Tribal Child Welfare (G.1)

Tribal Consultation Policy. The Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) adopted a policy effective March 10, 2005 related to consultation with tribes. DCFS and other DHFS administrators and staff met with tribal leaders and staff in November 2005 on human services and health issues. This was the first of meetings that will occur at least annually between Department and Tribal leadership. The discussions will result in an implementation plan for the DHFS tribal consultation policy. The first priority was the development of a curriculum to be used in training DHFS staff on issues related to Indian culture, sovereignty, relationships with the state and counties, and related topics. A draft of that curriculum has been established and the DHFS workgroup is in the process of developing a schedule for the provision of the training to DHFS staff.

ICWA Requirements. The DHFS has included in its legislative package the proposal that ICWA be incorporated into Wisconsin statutes in Ch. 48 (the Children's Code) and Ch. 938 (the Juvenile Justice Code). This is one of the seven tribal priorities included in the PEP and the five-year Child and Family Service Plan, and thus has the support of the Wisconsin tribal child welfare program managers. DCFS is currently waiting to hear from Department staff as to whether the legislation will be considered in the current legislative session that ends in March 2006.

Tribal Access to eWiSACWIS. DCFS staff and tribal representatives have had several discussions related to providing access to eWiSACWIS to tribal child welfare agencies. Not all of the tribes are interested in utilizing the system for case management, and some would like read-only access so that they can follow ICWA cases involving their children in several counties in the state. DCFS is attempting to determine how other states and the tribes in those states have dealt with the variety of issues related to tribal access. The system access issue will continue to be discussed with tribes on an ongoing basis.

13. Family Member Engagement (H.1) and Non-Custodial Parents (I.1)

The Out-of-Home Care Committee's Birth Family Involvement Workgroup has been assigned these items and will work on them simultaneously because an initial review of the tasks by the workgroup indicates a significant amount of overlap. The workgroup has begun to identify tools for locating relatives and parents, and has decided to develop one policy if possible. Members have been assigned to review current policy and law to determine what barriers exist to engaging non-custodial fathers, and relatives.

14. Policy on Sharing Information with Relatives and Potential Caregivers (H.2)

A draft Information Memo (copy attached) identifying information that can be shared with relatives was approved by the Out-of-Home Care Committee and posted to the PEP Bulletin Board.

Comments were received and DCFS staff was directed to obtain an opinion from Office of Legal Counsel regarding one question. DCFS is waiting for a response from legal counsel and plan to issue the memo in Quarter 5.

DCFS asked State Senator Carol Roessler to introduce an amendment to 2005 Wisconsin Senate Bill 284 (copy attached) that would allow information to be shared with relatives prior to or at the time of placement in the same manner as information is shared with licensed foster parents. SB 284, passed the Wisconsin Senate in October 2005, and has been sent to the Wisconsin Assembly, where it received a public hearing in November 2005. Further action is pending in the Assembly.

15. Relative Placement Survey (H.4.)

The survey to gather information about the use of relatives as placement resources was delayed due to the use of new technology to use online surveys instead of paper surveys. DCFS staff are currently incorporating final edits to the survey in an online version which will allow for easier completion by agency staff and will automatically calculate information contained in the survey. The survey should be issued and information compiled by the end of Quarter 5.

16. Family Assessment and Case Planning (J.1.b)

Based on recommendations of a workgroup of the PEP Case Process Committee, DCFS is pursuing modifications to family assessment, case plan and case progress evaluation documents in eWiSACWIS. These documents form the basis of the Wisconsin Model for CPS case management. Counties have indicated that the documents are long and difficult to use, making the documents not user friendly for families. Revisions to the documents were developed in Quarter 4 and changes in eWiSACWIS are scheduled for June 2006.

17. Barriers to Engagement (J.3)

During Quarter 4, the Child Welfare Case Process Committee reviewed the results of the focus groups in order to develop actions/tasks based on the barriers identified. Actions/tasks were identified in categories of practice, resources, cultural, agency, communication/coordination, mental health & AODA, and training. The eWiSACWIS project team members have been involved in the necessary system design changes, which will continue in Quarter 5.

In addition, DCFS staff will work with the Child Welfare Training Partnerships during Quarter 5 to revise training courses to enhance the engagement skills of caseworkers. DCFS and the Training Partnerships will also provide training and technical assistance to child welfare supervisors on removing barriers to family engagement and revise Core Training Curriculum to include methodologies for establishing and maintaining family engagement.

18. Caseworker-Parent/Family Face-to-Face Contact Policy (J.4)

During Quarter 4, the Child Welfare Case Process Committee continued to review and revise the draft policy. In addition, the policy was posted a second time to the PEP Bulletin Board and those comments guided further revisions. In September, the policy was provided to Wisconsin County

Human Services Association (WCHSA) for approval. The final policy was issued via DCFS Memo Series 2005-10 (copy attached).

During Quarter 5, DCFS BPP staff will train CPS supervisors through roundtables, who in turn, will work with caseworkers on meeting the minimum requirements of this policy. To date, a BPP staff has conducted one roundtable and is coordinating to schedule the remaining regions. A BPP staff will also create a Q & A document that will be provided to agencies through regional Area Administration as a reference. Finally, BPP staff will work with the Child Welfare Training Partnerships to update courses to increase effectiveness of worker visits.

19. Services to Foster Parents (K.1.a.3)

The Out-of-Home Care Committee developed a report of the service and support needs of foster parents that included a variety of recommendations to address the identified needs. This report was developed after meetings with foster parents and a variety of agency staff statewide who work with foster families. Many of the suggestions are currently included as separate items in the Program Enhancement Plan, such as the provision of training for foster parents and a foster parent handbook.

An informational memo and the summary report with recommendations were posted to the bulletin board this fall. The info memo (copy attached) and supporting document are currently being reviewed in the Division and will be distributed as a resource and reference for local agencies to use with their foster parents and to inform ongoing PEP action steps.

20. Support Plans for Foster Parents (K.1.a.4)

The Out-of-Home Care Committee developed a draft memo (copy attached) that summarizes current statutory requirements about the inclusion of support services for foster parents in a child's permanency plan and provides examples of support plan documents for reference or use by agencies. The memo and attachments were posted to the PEP Bulletin Board in October and were finalized by the committee at the October meeting. Members of the committee and people who commented on the bulletin board did not recommend requiring the development of support plans for every foster home, but recommended providing examples of support plan documents for use by agency staff. As a result, DCFS will reconsider the need for a policy memo.

21. Foster Child Assessment (K.2)

The goal of this benchmark task is to develop an instrument to better assess children's needs to provide better information to foster parents. The Out-of-Home Care Committee discussed the specific purpose or intent this item was to address and decided to focus on revising the existing Information to Foster Parents form (CFS-872B) to better categorize and capture information in a method that would indicate areas in which a child may need additional assessment or screening. Instead of containing a list of indicators or behaviors a child may have, the form will contain the same information divided into categories such as attachment indicators, medical diagnosis, sexual behaviors or development, and others.

The Committee reviewed a revised draft of the form at the November 2005 meeting and committee members take the tool to their agencies to pilot and test the revisions.

22. Managed Care in Milwaukee (L.1)

DCFS is collaborating with the Division of Health Care Financing (DHCF) to pilot a program in Milwaukee County for provision of Medicaid-covered services to children in foster care, court-ordered Kinship Care, and subsidized adoptions using a managed care organization (MCO). The MCO staff will work with the Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare (BMCW) to develop comprehensive assessments and service plans for physical, mental, and dental health service needs.

Abri Health Plan, a new Medicaid HMO, was issued the intent to contract award letter by the DHCF based on the recommendation of the RFP evaluation committee. Contract negotiations are currently underway with the goal of having a contract in place by the first quarter of 2006. A Milwaukee community advisory committee has been established to participate in implementation of the managed care program. There are subcommittees on Consumer Governance, Quality Assurance, and Rate Setting.

Abri is contracting with Wraparound Milwaukee to oversee the behavioral health services for children. Wraparound Milwaukee, a program within the Milwaukee County Health and Human Service Department, provides mental health care to children with serious emotional and mental health needs. Wraparound Milwaukee already has a network of therapists and other professionals as well as services such as crisis intervention. BMCW will work with Abri on the mental health screening and assessment tools used to develop service plans.

23. Mental Health Screening (M.1)

The Department of Health and Family Service (DHFS) has an internal workgroup to address child welfare screening that consists of members from DCFS, the Bureau of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services (BMHSAS), the Division of Health Care Finance (DHCF), and a consulting psychiatrist. The group has identified a tiered screening tool, the California's Mental Health Screening Tool (CMHST), for children involved in the child welfare system at ages 0-5 years (tier 1), and young adults ages 5-17 years (tier 2). The third tier of the screening tool, designed for parents/caregivers mental health, is currently being considered for recommendation. The CMHST met the following criteria:

- 1) Screen must be simple without the need for mental health professional evaluation and interpretation, i.e. yes/no;
- 2) Must be able to be administered quickly and easily by social worker or case manager;
- 3) Must identify red flags for children who may need more comprehensive screening and/or assessment of mental health/substance problems;
- 4) Must be inexpensive and cost effective to administer;
- 5) Must be age and developmentally appropriate, culturally competent; and
- 6) Must have established reliability and validity, or there is evidence of tool having been used effectively with the same population as Wisconsin intends, with good results.

In January 2006, all three tiers of the CMHST will be presented to key stakeholders involved in the Case Process Committee for consideration and input. Upon reaching an agreement on the screening tool, the internal workgroup will pilot the screening tool in volunteer counties sometime in Quarter 6. The goal is to offer the tool to counties who are willing to implement it as a part of their Initial Assessment process, under the Child Functioning Element, and provide feedback on its application and efficacy. Concurrent with piloting the screening portion of the mental health capacity improvement plan, the internal work group will begin addressing the issues involved in subsequent mental health assessment and treatment.

24. Ch. HFS 44, Administrative Rule on Reasonable Efforts and Permanency Planning (N.1)

The DHFS Rules Coordinator reviewed the second and third draft of the Proposed Order for HFS 44. DCFS has decided to circulate the draft rule to counties, tribes, judges, legal staff and other stakeholders for review before proceeding further in the rules process. A copy of the current draft rule is attached.

A workgroup will be established in December 2005 to review the latest draft and complete its work by March 2006. The proposed rule then will be submitted to the DHFS Rules Coordinator to continue the rules process. DCFS anticipates publication of the rule by October 2006. The effective date of the rule is contingent on legislative approval of the administrative rule.

25. Availability of Adoptive Resource (O.1)

The Adoption Services Committee has developed a form to assess the readiness of children for adoption to facilitate the permanency planning process. The adoption readiness form will be used with the Continuous Permanency Planning timeline (see Benchmark O.3) as part of the Permanency Consultation process. The draft form was posted to the PEP Bulletin Board for public comment. The final form will be issued in Quarter 5 via a DCFS Information Memo (copy attached). Training on this and the Concurrent Planning Timeline began in September 2005 and will continue through December 2005.

DCFS has reviewed state statutes and administrative rules and determined that neither statute nor rule prohibit termination of parental rights in the absence of an identified adoptive resource. This has been communicated to counties at the regional level by state permanency consultants. The clarification will be included in the informational memo for the adoption readiness form.

26. Concurrent Planning Timeline (O.3)

The Adoption Services Committee completed a draft DCFS Memo (copy attached) on the Continuous Permanency Planning Timeline. The timelines identify which county and adoption staff need to be involved, when and for what purpose. The Continuous Permanency Planning Timeline has gone through the PEP Bulletin Board comment process. The memo will be issued in Quarter 5.

Starting in September 2005, DCFS provided training regionally to supervisors of the county staff involved in developing the permanency plan and associated court reports. In addition, the 13 State

Permanency Consultants jointly provided training to county out-of-home care staff as a regular part of their consultation process. DCFS developed a training team for each region and the training will be completed by December 2005

27. Foster Parent Survey (P.3)

In Quarter 3, the Out-of-Home Care Committee decided that the use of a survey to determine the participation of foster parents in court proceedings was not necessary. Members thought that, through agency and worker experience and previous surveys to foster parents, the scope of participation or lack of participation in court proceedings was already apparent.

Members believe that foster parents are not attending court proceedings or submitting information to the court for the following reasons: 1) foster parents may not be aware of their right to be heard, 2) foster parents may not be aware of the methods by which they can be heard, 3) foster parents may not receive notice of court hearings, and 4) agencies may not be educating or providing information to foster parents about the right to receive notice of court proceedings or their right to be heard.

In Quarter 5, the Committee will be developing ways to address the lack of foster parent participation in court proceedings as identified in Benchmark Task P.2 and additional methods.

28. Defining Staff Training Requirements (R.1)

Recommendations from the ad hoc committee on child welfare training were introduced to the State Child Welfare Training Council for final consideration at the September meeting. The Training Council approved the recommendations (copy attached) for pre service and in-service training requirements for child welfare workers as well as training recommendations for supervisors.

The recommendations will form the basis for DCFS to develop an administrative rule. The state child welfare training coordinator has begun the process of drafting the new administrative rule related to child welfare training and is working with the Office of Legal Counsel to promulgate the rule by July 2006. The effective date of the rule is contingent on legislative approval of the administrative rule.

The Training Partnerships are currently working on developing web-based curriculum for the pre-service content areas. Workgroups have been established to develop curriculum content based on the content areas defined by the ad hoc committee.

29. eWiSACWIS Training (R.3)

The eWiSACWIS training committee was formed in Quarter 4 and includes two county/agency representatives from each regional training partnership, two training partnership representatives, two DCFS representatives, two eWiSACWIS system representatives, and the statewide curriculum coordinator for the training system. The role of the committee is described in the attached committee charge.

The committee will begin meeting regularly in December 2005 to look at how best to integrate eWiSACWIS into new and existing child welfare program training; as well as develop ways to provide ongoing technical assistance for the eWiSACWIS system. As new worker pre-service training is being developed, the new worker eWiSACWIS web-based trainings are being integrated into these pre-service modules.

30. Service Array Survey (T.1)

The DCFS convened a workgroup to address the array of services available across Wisconsin. This workgroup was based on the CFSR finding that the Wisconsin child welfare service system does not offer the full range of services needed for safety and permanency and that some services are not available in all counties. The Wisconsin County Human Services Association identified nine counties of various population sizes to assist DCFS in this process. The Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare has a participant on the group. The Office of Strategic Finance also has a regional Area Administration representative involved with the workgroup. To facilitate the service array survey process, DCFS is using assistance from the National Child Welfare Resource Center for Organizational Improvement to develop the survey tool.

The first meeting of the workgroup was held on November 2, 2005. At this meeting, the workgroup reviewed a sample survey and service definitions. The draft Service Array survey will be piloted by counties participating in the workgroup in January of 2006. The workgroup will convene again on January 31, 2006 to discuss the survey format and results. It is anticipated that this survey will be distributed to all counties via a web-based format in February of 2006.

The same workgroup will be used to develop the workload survey under Action Step T.2. The survey is intended to evaluate child welfare workloads and provide information for analysis of staffing and caseload ratios. The workload survey will be developed in the Spring of 2006 once the Service Array Survey has been completed.

Quarter 5 Activities

1. Foster and Adoptive Family Assessments (D.5)

The Adoption Services Committee is currently looking at both a combined foster family assessment (FFA) and adoptive family assessment (AFA) and the structured analysis family evaluation (SAFE) as tools to accomplish this PEP task. In July 2005, the Adoption Services Committee plus other interested foster care and adoption workers attended a presentation on SAFE. The SAFE tool was subsequently posted to the PEP Bulletin Board and comments received were very positive.

A smaller work group of the Adoption Services Committee developed a combined FFA/AFA that has been distributed to all committee members plus it was posted to the PEP Bulletin Board for comment. In addition, DCFS is going to do a mass mailing in November 2005 to all county foster care coordinators and adoption workers to seek comments by December 2005. Comments will be reviewed at the Adoption Services Committee meeting in January 2006 so the committee can make a recommendation on what study process should be used for adoptive families.

The Adoption Services Committee will complete its review of the options and develop a recommendation by the end of Quarter 5. This is necessary in order to get the assessment tool on the eWiSACWIS project list for development and implementation by Quarter 8.

2. Foster Parent Training (K.4)

The Training Partnerships volunteered to coordinate a subcommittee to discuss foster parent training expectations and topics. The subcommittee has held several meetings and is currently discussing training expectations that would include pre-placement, foundation, and ongoing training, paralleling the newly created worker training requirements. Pre-placement training would include information that is critical for foster parents to know before taking a placement, and foundation training would be more in-depth information within a foster parent's initial two-year licensing period. Ongoing training is yet to be defined.

3. Foster Parent Handbook (K.5)

The Foster Care and Adoption Resource Center staff coordinated two statewide meetings to begin work on the foster parent handbook. They are actively seeking input and using state and national examples of handbooks to guide the development of a statewide handbook. The final product will include a starting point for foster parents to have standard information about state and local agency expectations.

PEP Data Update

The data required for the PEP includes information on state performance relative to national standards relating to safety and permanency as well as progress on the CFSR case review outcome items for which Wisconsin established improvement targets.

The PEP data will come from several sources, including eWISACWIS reports specifically designed for PEP performance measurement, eWISACWIS data submitted for federal AFCARS and NCANDS purposes, results from the state CQI case reviews, and other data collection methods.

1. Status of NCANDS and AFCARS Reporting

DCFS will submit its first NCANDS Child and Agency Files for the FFY 2005 reporting period in March 2006. At this point, the federal ACF will be able to use the FFY 2005 Child File to compute state performance on safety national standards. Until the FFY 2005 file is available, state performance continues to be estimated based on state data. State performance cannot be computed using prior year NCANDS data because the state submitted only the Summary Data Component (SDC) information.

As of July 2004, all counties had implemented the eWiSACWIS system and data used to measure state performance for PEP implementation thus far has been drawn from the eWiSACWIS Maltreatment Recurrence and Maltreatment in Out-of-Home Care reports. DCFS is preparing for its first NCANDS Child File submission and will work with the federal NCANDS contractor (Walter R. McDonald and Associates) to address questions related to the NCANDS file submission. DCFS has completed design and development of a NCANDS data error report to better monitor and address data quality and practice issues. This report will be tested by BMCW and county agency volunteers in December 2005 and will be issued to authorized BMCW and county agency staff, supervisors and managers in February 2006.

The state continues to improve the quality of the AFCARS Foster Care data. The DCFS has identified cases where the child's latest removal date is inaccurate in cases where adoption is identified as the discharge reason for that placement episode. Removal data for these cases was corrected in September 2005 using the new Placement History Correction functionality described in the last PEP Quarterly Update. By December 2005, the DCFS will re-submit AFCARS Foster Care files for FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 to enable more accurate calculations of the state's performance in the Time to Adoption outcome measure. In addition, the DCFS has completed design and testing of its enhancements to the AFCARS Error Reports for both Foster Care and Adoption File data elements. These enhancements provide more user-friendly, ready-to-use report outputs regarding AFCARS errors to managers, supervisors and staff. The enhanced AFCARS Error Reports will be issued by early January 2006.

Finally, to improve AFCARS data quality and state and federal calculations of the state's performance on the Permanency Outcomes, the state will begin to roll-out use of the new Placement History Correction functionality in the first half of CY 2006. Enhancements were made to improve this functionality in September 2006 and additional training and technical assistance materials are currently under development to support statewide roll-out efforts.

2. State Performance on National Standards

This update includes data on the national standards that was used for the Quarter 3 progress report and is based on the FFY 2004 permanency data profile sent to DCFS based on FFY 2004 AFCARS file (AB file), preliminary FFY 2004/FFY 2005 AFCARS file (BA file), state 2004 safety data from eWiSACWIS, and preliminary state 2005 safety data. The state baselines for the PEP are currently based on the FFY 2003 AFCARS annual file for permanency standards and state CY 2003 data for the safety standards. The minimum improvement targets were agreed to as part of federal approval of the PEP and must be achieved by the end of the two-year PEP period.

Once the DCFS has re-submitted the AFCARS files identified above and requests and receives the corrected data profiles for FFY 2004 and FFY 2005, results for Wisconsin's performance will be updated and/or corrected in the following chart. In addition, Wisconsin's performance on the safety outcomes will be updated once complete information for CY 2005 is available.

As indicated above, the state's ongoing performance monitoring for the safety performance standards is based on eWiSACWIS reports developed by the state and reviewed by the federal Children's Bureau. This review process took place during the Fall of 2004 prior to the federal approval of the state's PEP and included ACF regional office staff and members of the data team from the Children's Bureau. A chronology of the approval process is attached to this report. The report output used to calculate the state's performance on these measures will be provided to the Children's Bureau data team for further review. Any additional detail will be provided by DCFS as necessary in order to assist in the federal approval of the state's results to monitor performance pending submission of NCANDS Child File for FFY 05.

As indicated above, the state will submit its first NCANDS Child File for FFY 2005 in March 2006. The Children's Bureau will be able to use the data submitted by the state to calculate the state's performance on the safety standards. Given that this will be the first child file submitted the state, the DCFS anticipates some data quality issues. Such data quality concerns have been noted in the state's analysis of the CPS Timeliness PEP report and other data sources relying on eWiSACWIS data. Current efforts to identify and address data quality concerns are underway and described in Section 4. The DCFS will continue to use state eWiSACWIS reports to monitor performance until the Children's Bureau determines the NCANDS data is acceptable as the means to measure performance on the safety performance standards.

Wisconsin Achievement of National Performance Standards

Performance Standards	National Standard (Percent)	WI Data 2002 (Percent)	WI Data 2003 (Percent)	Minimum Improvement Target (Percent)	WI Data 2004 (Percent)	WI Data 2005 (Preliminary) (Percent)
Safety Outcome 1 – Recurrence of Maltreatment Of all children who were victims of substantiated maltreatment report, what percent were victims of another substantiated report within a 6-month period?	6.1 or less	6.04	7.13	6.23	5.25	4.97
Safety Outcome 2 – Maltreatment While in Care Of all children in out-of-home care, what percent experienced maltreatment by foster parents or facility staff members?	0.57 or less	0.26	0.30	Standard Met	0.57	0.62
Permanency Outcome 1 – Re-entry to Care Of all children who entered out-of-home care, what percent re-entered care within 12 months of a prior out-of-home care episode?	8.6 or less	22.2	21.5	20.15	18.9	21.5
Permanency Outcome 2 – Timely Reunification Of all children reunified from out-of-home care, what percent were reunified within 12 months of entry into out-of-home care?	76.2 or more	66.5	65.2	67.62	70.1	79.8
Permanency Outcome 3 – Timely Adoption Of all children adopted from out-of-home, what percent were adopted within 24 months of their entry into out-of-home care?	32.0 or more	17.5	17.8	20.7	21.7	31.1*
Permanency Outcome 4 – Placement Stability Of all children in out-of-home care for less than 12 months, what percent experienced no more than 2 placement settings?	86.7 or more	92.3	92.6	Standard Met	90.5	90.7

Data Sources:

-- Safety Outcomes- 2002-2003 data are based on estimates derived from alternate methodology approved by the federal Children's Bureau; the 2004 & preliminary 2005 figures are derived solely from eWiSACWIS Maltreatment Recurrence and Maltreatment in Out of Home Care Outcome reports.

-- Permanency Outcomes- 2002-2004 and preliminary 2005 data are based on data profile figures generated by the federal Children's Bureau using the state's FFY AFCARS submissions; preliminary 2005 data is based on AFCARS files from the 2004B and 2005A reporting periods.

* Time to Adoption Data from the federal State Data Profile includes adoptions with incorrect removal dates; efforts to correct removal dates will be completed by September 2006

3. Analysis of State Performance- Update from Quarter 3 Progress Report

Safety Outcomes

Recurrence of Maltreatment- The DCFS continues to use the state eWiSACWIS report to monitor performance. The report is functioning as designed and indicates a maltreatment recurrence rate of 4.97% for the results associated with completed and approved CPS investigations for CY 2005 to date.

Maltreatment in Out-of-Home Care- Based on the eWiSACWIS Federal Outcome Report for preliminary 2005 (7/1/04 - 6/30/05 period) results, the estimated state performance is 0.62%, which is slightly over the national performance standard for Maltreatment in Out-of-Home Care. Performance for this period represents a slight increase over the CY 2004 rate of 0.57% and reflects the year-to-year fluctuations that occur with this measure.

In conducting a case specific review of these child victims, several cases have been identified that are not properly documented in eWiSACWIS and should not be included in this measure. These cases include instances where the substantiated case finding was successfully appealed by the foster parent and where the substantiated maltreater was incorrectly identified as a group home facility staff. The DCFS is in the process of compiling corrected lists of the actual cases for CY 2004 and CY 2005 where a child was a victim of substantiated maltreatment by a foster parent or a group home facility staff. These lists and the respective count of cumulative placements for the respective period(s) will be submitted for review and re-calculation of the state's performance on this outcome measure.

Permanency Outcomes

The performance for these four permanency measures is based on the recent permanency profile for Wisconsin generated by ACF from AFCARS data using the FFY 2004B file and the FFY 2005A file to create a "2005 BA" annualized file. DCFS is working with ACF to replicate the permanency profile at the state level and compare the federal performance calculations with the results of the eWiSACWIS Federal Outcome reports for the four permanency national standards.

The DCFS understands that data submitted to AFCARS for some children continues to result in data being excluded from the outcome calculations. In addition, the eWiSACWIS Federal Outcome Reports for these standards have provided different results for the four permanency standards. To better understand the impact of excluding cases in the federal outcome calculations and the discrepancies between the AFCARS-based permanency data profile and comparable state eWiSACWIS reports, the DCFS began a review of the file from ACF indicating all the AFCARS records that were not included in the above state profile. This review will enable the state to identify the reasons for exclusion and to develop strategies to correct and improve data quality.

Timely Adoption - The DCFS has identified and corrected inaccurate removal data for many cases in both FFY 2004 and FFY2005 periods. In September 2005, the DCFS made the necessary corrections to these removal dates using the state's placement history correction functionality developed within eWiSACWIS. By December 2005, the respective AFCARS Foster Care files will be re-submitted to the CB and the DCFS will request revised data profiles for the FFY 2004 and FFY 2004B/FFY 2005A and, once received from the CB, will add results for the FFY 2005 period.

Timely Reunification, Re-entry and Placement Stability - DCFS will make any necessary revisions to the state's performance based on the new data profile resulting from the above AFCARS Foster Care file re-submissions. In addition, updated results for FFY 2005 will be added once the state's data profile is received from the Children's Bureau data team.

Adjustments to State Baselines for National Standards

At this point, Wisconsin does not propose adjustments to the state baseline performance levels used to compute performance improvement targets for the PEP. Adjustments may be warranted for the timeliness to adoption and maltreatment in out-of-home care measures, but additional data clean-up activity, data analysis, and submittal to the Children's Bureau for review is needed before determining if any of the performance standard baselines should be adjusted.

4. PEP eWiSACWIS Performance Reports

The performance reports used for the PEP include two sets of reports. The first set of Federal Outcome Reports replicate the national performance standards for safety and permanency using data directly from eWiSACWIS rather than the AFCARS and NCANDS files. The PEP Performance Reports are used to measure the impact of PEP Action Steps for several safety, permanency and well being items.

Permanency Plan Report (D.6)- The next stage of PEP report development has included a new report on permanency plan goals for PEP Action Step D and CFSR Item 7. The DCFS has completed its analysis regarding the necessary modifications to an existing eWiSACWIS ad hoc report used by BMCW to monitor the status of permanency planning efforts and goal setting for statewide use. The report provides data on the timeliness and completion of permanency plans, the status of the permanency goal and changes to permanency goals over time. The identified modifications to this report are under development and the report will be issued for statewide use in February 2006. Like the PEP Reports, this report will be made available through eWReports and will be run on a monthly, quarterly and annual basis.

Federal Outcome Reports – The reports continue to be reviewed and maintained to ensure consistency with the federal national standards report syntax, improve report accuracy, and facilitate county use of the reports via the Reports Dashboard. In addition, enhancements are being made to the child detail output, adding a simple case list tab within the existing EXCEL worksheet. This enhancement has been requested by many agency staff and supervisors to enable them to better link the report results with specific cases and case outcomes.

The outcome reports are run on a quarterly and annualized basis and serve as a key data source to monitor performance on the national safety and permanency performance standards. Continued efforts are being made to analyze differences in the eWiSACWIS permanency outcome reports versus the federal calculations using AFCARS data.

Reports Dashboard – The web-based Reports Dashboard was implemented in June 2005 and allows agencies access to the federal Outcome Report information in an easy-to-use graphical format. Additional enhancements were made to the dashboard in September 2005. These enhancements included new query features and the addition of data charts to the graphical depictions of state or county specific results. The Reports Dashboard continues to be well received with local agency directors and supervisors. In Quarter 5, the ability to download graphs will be added to the dashboard functionality. Based on the regional sessions, there continues to be strong support by counties to use the Dashboard approach for data presentation. The DCFS will add the PEP Performance Reports to the Dashboard as resources permit.

eWiSACWIS PEP Reports – DCFS continues to work with the BMCW and county agencies to fine tune the reports used to provide information for the PEP. The DCFS has implemented a plan to provide ongoing communication and technical assistance to local

agency staff and to include agency staff in the report enhancement design and testing process.

Improvements have been made to the case detail worksheets to facilitate the use of the worksheets to help counties identify cases with incomplete or inaccurate information that affects individual county performance. This enhancement to the PEP reports will be implemented in December 2005. Detailed guides to each of the reports are also available to help counties work with staff on data entry, showing eWiSACWIS screen shots to identify how data entered by workers shows up in the reports.

The PEP Reports include statewide summary information, county summary information, county case detail in an Excel worksheet that can be sorted for further analysis, and an all-county comparison. These reports are being used, in conjunction with results from the case reviews, to serve as a primary or secondary data source to measure the state's performance in specific areas related to the PEP Action Steps and to the CFSR Performance Items. The PEP Reports address the following measures as either a primary or secondary data source as follows:

PEP Performance Measure	PEP Report Name	Primary Performance Data Source	Secondary Performance Data Source
Safety			
Timeliness of CPS Initial Assessments	CPS Initial Assessment Timeliness	PEP Report	Case Review Results
Safety Assessments, Plans and Services	CPS Safety	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Permanency			
Timeliness of ASFA Documentation	ASFA Documentation	PEP Report	Case Review Results
Completeness of ICWA Notification	ICWA Notification	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Sibling Placement	Siblings in Placement	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Independent Living Assessment and Planning	Independent Living	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Well Being			
Timeliness of Family Assessments & Case Planning	Family Assessments and Case Plans	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Monthly Contacts for Ongoing Cases	Contacts with Children and Parents	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Use of Education Screen for Ongoing Cases	Education Screen	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Use of Medical/MH Screen for Ongoing Cases	Medical Screen	Case Review Results	PEP Report

CPS Timeliness Report- For CFSR Safety Item 1 relating to timeliness of CPS investigations, DCFS developed a report using eWiSACWIS data on CPS Initial Assessments completed in the system. The Initial Assessment shows the date the CPS report was received, the assigned response time, and when the initial face-to-face contact with the children involved in the CPS report was attempted or occurred. Timeliness is measured based on the percentage of valid CPS reports where the face-to-face contact was occurred within the assigned response time. Response times can vary from 0-2 hours for high priority CPS reports to 2-5 days for low priority CPS reports.

The following data table shows data from Quarter 4 of CY 2004 and Quarters 1 - 3 of CY 2005. The report was created in December 2004 and while it could be run for earlier periods, statewide implementation of eWiSACWIS was completed in July 2004 so data prior to the Fall of 2004 would be incomplete. DCFS has recommended that the PEP baseline be established using the average of CY 2004 Q4 (43.0%) and CY 2005 Q1 (46.5%) for a PEP baseline of 44.8%. Based on the results for CY 2005 Q2 and Q3, the state is making some improvements in performance for this item.

Only cases where initial contact documentation is entered properly and with valid time intervals are used in the calculation to determine the timeliness of the initial face-to-face contact. As identified in the attached chart, a significant number of the records for each reporting period do not have the initial contact date entered or entered properly. In addition, a significant number of records are excluded due to invalid time interval calculations resulting from data entry errors associated with the report date/time or the initial contact date/time. Valid records included in the timeliness calculation include the results from those records where the time between the contact date and the report date is not a negative number and the report date and initial contact date is less than 100 days. These adjustments compensate for data quality issues that will improve as local agencies become accustomed to using the report. The DCFS is providing assistance to agencies regarding how dates and key data elements are properly entered into eWiSACWIS.

The DCFS has initiated several projects to address data quality issues associated with the initial assessment or CPS investigation documentation. First, a new eWiSACWIS report identifying data entry errors, omissions, and timeliness problems has been developed. The report will be tested by state and local agency staff during January 2006 and will be issued by February 2006. Also, the PEP report presenting summary and child/case detail associated with CPS investigation timeliness has been enhanced to provide a simple case listing of all cases subject to the report, increasing capacity for case specific examination of performance concerns. Finally, the newly issued Access Standards prescribed by PEP Action Step A.1 and the resulting changes to eWiSACWIS functionality to take place in March 2006 will provide additional opportunities to provide technical assistance and emphasis to documentation and the quality and accuracy of documentation.

BASELINE RESULTS

CPS Initial Assessment Face-to-Face Contact Timeliness- CY 2004, Q4

Statewide Results	0-2 Hrs	Same Day	24 Hrs	2-5 Days	N/A	Grand Totals
Total Records	265	1,169	1,092	4,293	125	6,944
Total Records Valid *	127	504	749	2,666	NA	4,046
<i>Percentage of Valid Records</i>	<i>47.9%</i>	<i>43.1%</i>	<i>68.6%</i>	<i>62.1%</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>58.3%</i>
Sub-Total within Response Time	50	213	203	1,273	NA	1,739
Sub-Total outside Response Time	77	291	546	1,393	NA	2,307
Percentage w/in Response Time	39.4%	42.3%	27.1%	47.7%	NA	43.0%

CPS Initial Assessment Face-to-Face Contact Timeliness- CY 2005, Q1

Statewide Results	0-2 Hrs	Same Day	24 Hrs	2-5 Days	N/A	Grand Totals
Total Records	269	1,254	1,265	4,688	152	7,628
Total Records Valid *	138	589	847	3,048	NA	4,622
<i>Percentage of Valid Records</i>	<i>51.3%</i>	<i>47.0%</i>	<i>67.0%</i>	<i>65.0%</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>60.6%</i>
Sub-Total within Response Time	96	267	290	1,494	NA	2,147
Sub-Total outside Response Time	42	322	557	1,554	NA	2,475
Percentage w/in Response Time	69.6%	45.3%	34.2%	49.0%	NA	46.5%

Baseline Performance Level- 44.8%

PERFORMANCE MONITORING RESULTS

CPS Initial Assessment Face-to-Face Contact Timeliness- CY 2005, Q2

Statewide Results	0-2 Hrs	Same Day	24 Hrs	2-5 Days	N/A	Grand Totals
Total Records	291	1,914	1,347	4,896	67	8,515
Total Records Valid *	151	638	911	3,148	NA	4,848
<i>Percentage of Valid Records</i>	<i>51.9%</i>	<i>33.3%</i>	<i>67.6%</i>	<i>64.3%</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>56.9%</i>
Sub-Total within Response Time	106	325	335	1,538	NA	2,304
Sub-Total outside Response Time	45	313	576	1,610	NA	2,544
Percentage w/in Response Time	70.2%	50.9%	36.8%	48.9%	NA	47.5%

CPS Initial Assessment Face-to-Face Contact Timeliness- CY 2005, Q3

Statewide Results	0-2 Hrs	Same Day	24 Hrs	2-5 Days	N/A	Grand Totals
Total Records	245	1,183	1,212	4,415	115	7,170
Total Records Valid *	129	569	819	2,882	NA	4,399
<i>Percentage of Valid Records</i>	<i>52.7%</i>	<i>48.1%</i>	<i>67.6%</i>	<i>65.3%</i>	<i>NA</i>	<i>61.4%</i>
Sub-Total within Response Time	96	239	277	1,469	NA	2,081
Sub-Total outside Response Time	33	330	542	1,413	NA	2,318
Percentage w/in Response Time	74.4%	42.0%	33.8%	51.0%	NA	47.3%

* Valid records include those records where contact information is documented as required, is not a negative ('-') number, and is not greater than 99 days.

Changes to PEP Matrix

The following changes were made to the PEP Matrix reflecting activity through the end of Quarter 4. See the updated Matrix attached to this report for more information.

A.2.b. – The workgroup that developed the Access Standard has completed the draft of the revised memo on case findings. The first draft was posted on the Bulletin Board for statewide review in October 2005. Further revisions were made in October and this will be re-posted for review in November 2005. Benchmark effective date modified.

A.2.c – Redesign of eWiSACWIS to support implementation of the Access Standard includes the support of the policy assuring that multiple reports of the same incident or episode are documented as “multiple report on same incident”. Benchmark Date modified to Q7.

B.1 – Safety Intervention Standards were posted to Bulletin Board in October 2005. Standards will be forwarded to WCHSA in December 2005 for review and approval. Standards will be issued on January 31, 2006. Effective date of the Standards will be changed to June 2006 to match the release date of changes in eWiSACWIS. Benchmark Date modified to reflect system changes.

C.1.b. – Workgroup was formed to develop Trial Home Visit Policy. Drafts reviewed at September, October and November Committee meetings. Draft being revised and will be reviewed by OHC in December. Completion dates for Benchmarks modified.

D.1 - Concurrent Permanency Planning. The benchmark task is revised to focus on training and technical assistance activities associated with the Continuous Permanency Planning Timeline under benchmark task O.3. Establishing concurrent goals at 12 months is emphasized in the Continuous Permanency Planning Timeline. Consideration of providing additional policy direction will be deferred until the public comment period for the Ch. HFS 44 administrative rule on reasonable efforts and permanency planning.

- The task title is changed to concurrent permanency planning
- Task D.1.1 is changed to developing support strategies rather than policy.
- Task D.1.2 is changed to focus on State Permanency Consultant activities.

D.3 – Brochure was created by workgroup and posted to PEP Bulletin Board on two separate occasions. The comments assisted in further development of the brochure. Brochure will be made available on the internet and can be ordered in hard copy through the DHFS Publication Center once final edits are completed. Completion dates for Benchmark modified

D.4.2 - DCFS memo on definition of “difficult to place and at risk children” has been drafted will be provided to OHC Committee in December for review and comment. Completion date on D.4.2 is modified to Quarter 5 to accommodate review.

D.6 - Based on the report development process, the permanency planning report will be released in February 2006. Benchmark Date modified to reflect change.

E.1.a - This item is expected to be issued in Quarter 5. Benchmark date is delayed due to additional feedback from committee members

E.3 – All items that include revisions to Ch. HFS 56 have been coordinated to be in the same Quarters. Changes will be submitted for legislative review in Q7 and issues or implemented in Q8 (see items K.4 and K.5). Benchmark dates changed to show change.

F.1.a and F.1.b – Ongoing Service Standards. The benchmark task to revise the CPS Ongoing Service Standards under F.1.b is eliminated. This task was to incorporate the Family Interaction policy issued under task F.1.a into the Standards as part of a comprehensive revision of the Standards. As explained in the General PEP Updates section of the Quarter 4 progress report, the comprehensive revision of the Standards is being deferred until after the PEP period. The Family Interaction policy will remain in effect via DCFS Numbered Memo.

- Task F.1.a.4 in the original Matrix is deleted and the other tasks under F.1.a are renumbered.
- The eWiSACWIS release date is included in the renumbered task F.1.a.4.
- All of task F.1.b is deleted. Note: Task F.1.b.3 is the same as the renumbered task F.1.a.5.

F.2.3 – Minor changes to Numbered Memo as a result of WCHSA review. Memo will be issued in Q5. Benchmark date modified accordingly.

F.2.4 – ICWA Specialist hired in Q4. Benchmark date modified to allow Specialist time to meet with counties and tribes.

G.1 – Benchmark date modified to reflect ongoing revisions to Tribal Consultation policy

H.2. – Information Memo identifying information that can be shared with relatives was approved by the OHC Committee and posted to Bulletin Board. Awaiting opinion from Legal Counsel, and hope to issues Memo in Q5.

Amendment to SB 284 sent to Wisconsin Assembly, where it received Public Hearing. Further action pending in Assembly. The completion benchmark H.2 changed to Q5 is modified accordingly.

H.4 – Survey was delayed in September due to the use of new technology to employ an online survey format. Information has been entered into the online format, but additional edits were necessary. The survey should be completed and information compiled by the end of Q5.

J.1.a and J.1.b – Ongoing Service Standards. The benchmark task to revise the CPS Ongoing Service Standards under J.1.a is eliminated. This task was to incorporate the family assessment and case planning procedures revised under task J.1.b into the Standards as part of a comprehensive revision of the Standards. As explained in the General PEP Updates section of the Quarter 4 progress report, the comprehensive revision of the Standards is being deferred until after the PEP period. The family assessment, case plan, and case progress evaluation formats in eWiSACWIS will be changed to make the documents more user friendly to families.

- Most of task J.1.a is deleted. The workgroup and eWiSACWIS activities are included in task J.1.b.
- Task J.1.b is revised to focus on changes to Wisconsin Model procedures, including modifying the family assessment, case plan and case progress evaluation formats in eWiSACWIS.

K.1.a.4 – Committee members and comments from the Bulletin Board did not recommend requiring the development of support plans for every foster home, but recommended providing examples of support plan documents for use by agency staff. The task is changed to making a recommendation on support plans.

L.2 – Benchmark dates modified to reflect early 2006 implementation of the managed care contract.

M.1 – Mental Health Screening. The benchmark task is revised to clarify activities that will be done to pilot a mental health screening tool that can be used by county child welfare agencies and subsequent activities to create a capacity improvement plan.

- The Action step description and benchmark task introduction are revised to clarify the testing of a mental health screening tool.
- A new task M.1.c is created to indicate that the screening tool will be piloted by counties.
- Other tasks are clarified to indicate how input will be obtained on screening, assessment and treatment issues before updating the Wisconsin Model.

N.1 – DHFS Rules Coordinator reviewed 2nd and 3rd draft of Proposed Order. Workgroup will be established in December 2006 and will complete work by March 2006. DCFS anticipated publication by October 2006. Benchmark Date modified to reflect change.

N.2 - . The benchmark task to revise the CPS Ongoing Service Standards is eliminated. This task was to include PEP policies issued under other action steps as part of a comprehensive revision of the Ongoing Service Standards, including convert current practice guidelines to standards. As explained in the General PEP Updates section of the Quarter 4 progress report, the comprehensive revision of the Standards is being deferred until after the PEP period. Other policy standards, including HFS 44 and the CPS Investigation Standards must be implemented/updated before the Ongoing Service Standards can be revised.

- Activities completed under tasks N.2.1 and N.2.2 remain because these activities were completed.
- The deletion of task N.2 affects tasks F.1.b and J.1.a.

O.1 – Info Memo and final product are moving through the approval process. Tribes asked for additional information to be added to make the form culturally competent. These are included in the final versions. At the end of Q4, 3 of 5 regions were trained. The remaining 2 regions will be trained in Q5. Benchmark date modified

O.3 – Numbered memo and final product are moving through the approval process. Trainings started with county staff. At the end of Q4, 3 of 5 regions were trained. Remaining 2 regions will be trained in Q5. Benchmark date modified.

Q.4 – Review activities for BMCW began in September 05 and will be completed in December 05. Discussions with OPEP and BMCW resulting in modification of case review instrument to record specific data elements on the cases reviewed. Due to discussions, Benchmark Dates modified.

R.3.a - Established workgroup to identify and define ongoing training needs related to the eWiSACWIS system. Benchmark date modified to Q4

T.1 – Workgroup established and met in November 2005. Survey and analysis will be completed by counties in Q5. Benchmark date modified.